VOL. 10, NO. 20 MAY 27, 1961

NATIONAL REVIEW

Bulletin

Chinamen's Chance? p. 1

Gagarinia p. 6

De Gaulle's Loneliness p. 3

EDITOR: William F. Buckley Jr. PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher
EDITORS: L. Brent Bozell, James Burnham, Willmoore Kendall, Frank S. Meyer
MANAGING EDITOR: Priscilla Buckley

Joseph Alsop has used the figure 150,000,000—*one hundred fifty million human beings:* more, probably, than would be killed by an exchange of hydrogen bombs between the U.S. and the USSR—as the likely number of men and women scheduled to die of starvation to bring Communism to Red China. So to speak, the Final Solution to the bourgeois problem. Even assuming the figure is way off, there is no denying the breathtaking scope of the suffering being imposed on the people of China by Mao Tse-tung and his fanatical ideologists. Starvation, on a scale unknown, wracks the entire nation (what a novel André Malraux could write, on revisiting the tortured country he described in his classic, *Man's Fate!*). Only the army is fed. Mao may be a revolutionary, but he recognizes the ancient verities of power. Polybius said: Feed the army, pay the soldiers their salary, and don't worry about civil disturbances.

The United States Government is faced with one of those rare yet recurring opportunities that could alter the course of the great struggle. In terms of the cold business at hand, the suffering of the Chinese Communist people must be understood not in terms of the overwhelming sense of sympathy we must and do feel for the Chinese, but in terms of the tactical and strategic possibilities that suggest themselves. Not since the day Mao Tse-tung took power has Red China been weaker than it is at this moment. This, therefore, is the moment to bear down on every one of the many pressure points—the moment to take the bold and single-purposed action our talkative President is always talking about, to capitalize on the successful tour of Lyndon Johnson, to agitate for nothing less than the overthrow of the Communist overlords. How? It is surely a problem worth the full attention of our technicians at the National War College and the State Department and the CIA, worth a crash effort of the strategical minds in town. For one thing, we need a positive, unambiguous statement to the effect that under no circumstances will the United States remain a member of any international organization that recognizes the legitimacy of Mao's government.—For another, active, intense, immediate aid to the counterrevolutionary forces in Indonesia.—Encouragement to Diem in South Vietnam to use his army and other forces, and the unique anti-Communist spirit of his people, to press against North Vietnam, ruled over by the despised Ho Chi Minh.—Radio stations, broadcasting liberation.—An all-Asian army; the unleashing of Chiang's army; an ultimatum upon the North Koreans to observe the truce terms; pressure on India to assert its rights on the eastern frontier; arms, food, literature, for the underground; a total effort, waged with the same singleness of purpose Mr. Kennedy showed in his campaign to become President of the United States. The alternative is a more terrible Budapest, a slow, massive liquidation of tens of millions of people in the crucible of socialism. In humanitarian terms the problem is compelling enough. Strategically, what is at stake is the loss of the single greatest opportunity for the West since the institution of the policy of containment.

The WEEK

● Kennedy suggests that the Federal Government pay for Presidential campaign expenses. Oedipus complex?

● Two important bills are being rushed through the Congress. The first is President Kennedy's $2.5 billion aid-to-education program, now awaiting action in the Senate. The education lobby must pass this bill during the present session, if it is to pass at all, because each year it becomes more obvious that no federal aid is needed or wanted by the nation's school districts. The second bill, passed by the Senate and now in the House, would step up aid to the Communist satellites of Eastern Europe, and allow the President to aid even those nations that are supplying the Communist bloc with strategic materials. It would vastly strengthen the powers of the Executive in distributing aid. President Kennedy is pushing for early passage of these bills, and the only hope for their defeat lies in pressure by conservatives on their congressmen.

● Senator Albert Gore (D., Tenn.) has served as one of two Senate advisers to the U.S. delegation at the Geneva test-ban conference since it began in 1958. Last month,

Gore found that the conference had taken "a decidedly discouraging turn"—that the Soviets were insisting on veto power in any international organization created to supervise nuclear tests—an impossible demand, he felt. He cabled Kennedy from Geneva and suggested that there was no reason for continuing the negotiations in Geneva if the Soviet veto demand is continued. Now Gore finds himself out of his position as Senate adviser. Vice President Johnson replaced him with Senators John Sparkman of Alabama and Clinton Anderson of New Mexico.

● United Nations authorities in the Congo, who connived with President Joseph Kasavubu in the kidnapping of Moise Tshombe, are now faced with a problem they have so far studiedly ignored. And that is what to do about Antoine Gizenga, the pro-Communist leader who has set himself up in Eastern Province and claims to be Patrice Lumumba's legitimate successor. In order to destroy Tshombe and Katanga—the UN's preoccupation thus far—the United Nations made a deal with Kasavubu and consequently is now committed to supporting his call for a reconvening of the Parliament. But Gizenga won't play. He has sent out a parallel call for the Parliament to meet in Kamina—not Léopoldville—and announces that a sixty-mile area around Kamina is to be cleared of all but the troops of UN contingents sympathetic to him (Ghana, Guinea, UAR, India, Mali, Togo, etc.) and that he, and not Kasavubu, will run the show. (Kamina, incidentally, is in Katanga.) To date, this extraordinary impudence has not been challenged by the UN, which evidently feels its worries are over, now that it has deposed the leader of the pro-Western forces in the Congo.

Behrendt, *Algemeen Handlsblad*, Amsterdam

"A little more patience—I'm almost ready!"

● It's too early yet to determine with any precision the strength of the new South Korean regime or even to venture a prediction on its durability. But the situation in South Korea had deteriorated badly in the past six months, and new riots and demonstrations, akin to those that toppled Syngman Rhee, were in the making. Unemployment was widespread, corruption endemic. And while Premier John Chang, in the opinion of all who know him, is honesty incarnate, a sincere and hard-working public servant, he lacks the one essential ingredient of leadership: decisiveness. He hadn't the steel to throw the rascals out. The generals who rose against him, by all reports, have the qualities Dr. Chang lacked. They are young, forceful, tough. They have fought the Communists and know what Communism means. And they are patriots. The government they intend to establish, whatever its other qualities, will be firmly anti-Communist, as Peiping and Moscow very well know since they have already and virulently attacked the new regime and its leaders. It might be wise for *our* leaders—at least for the moment—to stop shooting from the hip and pay heed to the words of General Van Fleet, who commanded the Korean Army during the war. "We have no stauncher ally than the Korean Army. It's one of the world's most able fighting organizations. Let's keep it on our side." The generals' revolts in Pakistan, Turkey and the Sudan did not damage either the cause of freedom, or of anti-Communism.

● South Vietnam political and military leaders are thoroughly alarmed over the Geneva Conference on Laos which will, they are certain—whatever the face-saving formula adopted—mean the loss of Laos to the Communist camp. The Vietnamese army is already having a hard enough time fighting the Communist guerrillas infiltrated from North Vietnam and "neutralist" Cambodia. Now it is faced with the prospect of having to guard hundreds of miles of additional border territory, much of it paralleling the long thin southern finger of Laos. The Vietnamese, supported by the Thais, have proposed what they regard as an entirely feasible minimum operation: that they should seal off this finger at its northern joint, and clean out the pockets of Communists south of the line, which would secure at least one major part—and the most threatening part—of Laotian territory. In their opinion, the idea of "letting Laos go" and "then firmly defending Thailand and South Vietnam" is ridiculous. In the strategic situation, the proper theater for the defense of Vietnam and Thailand is located, precisely, in Laos—which is exactly what our "hard-fighting" diplomats in Geneva are about to give away.

● The new Prime Minister of Gabon, according to a recent news dispatch, was at one time, when Gabon was still under French rule, convicted of selling his mother-in-law (one of them) into slavery. The Italian magazine *Borghese* records a denial of any wrongdoing, with the explanation that "he sold his mother-in-law to finance the liberation of the *patria*." One needs must make distinctions.

● They wrote of Gable that he was king; but this Sunday past we sorrowed for another of that crop of movie greats so rapidly being threshed by time, and if this man was

not a king, we question the title. In his early twenties Gary Cooper was a romantic lead; love became him still in the afternoon of his fifties. No longer legs were ever slung over a saddle; no man sat so tall. Comedy or drama, two Oscars. But he was more than an actor. He was good and he was true and to this such friends as James Stewart and John Wayne stand witness, as does the beautiful woman he loved and honored to his grave. A Christian gentleman, he faced death in life as courageously as ever he faced it in *Beau Geste* or *The Plainsman*. Well, what we'd like to know, Mr. Death, is how do you like our blue-eyed boy?

The de Gaulle Equilibrium

The Revolt of the Generals and its aftermath expresses a paradox: that the spectacular proof of de Gaulle's personal power is at the same time a demonstration of his political weakness.

It was by the sheer power of his towering personality, of his awe-striking voice, his mystique and image, that de Gaulle first brought the tide of revolt to a halt, turned it back on its course, and dissolved it. As person, commander, leader, he was simply too much for the generals, as well as for the colonels, pilots, junior officers, and chiefs of the seething *colons*. His will, supported by that absolute conviction of authenticity, broke their wills made vulnerable by an inner clash of loyalties.

But this was a purely individual, personal triumph, not a political victory. In the crisis, the vast majority in metropolitan France was "for de Gaulle," but there was not, and there is not, any coherent Gaullist political force. Since the revolt's collapse, in the inevitable backwash, a massive purge is taking place: throughout the army, especially in the officer corps, in the governmental apparatus and to a certain extent in civil life. The revolt-tainted military units are being liquidated and their individual members, if not court-martialed, reassigned.

Who are these men, in political terms, that are being purged? Those who revolted, supported the revolt, or wavered, of course. But these include the central cadres of the armed forces, the firmest anti-Communists, and many of the best right-wing and conservative elements. It follows by simple mathematics that purging them seriously weakens the army, on the one hand, and the anti-Communists and Right on the other. This means that through the Algerian revolt and its aftermath the structure of the French state has been injured, and the equilibrium of political forces within French society has swung to the Left. De Gaulle as an individual was able to master the generals through his own will. But he is not the master of the political equilibrium that provides the base of his government and of the French state more generally. He is, rather, its victim, or instrument. He cannot avoid being thrust, however unwillingly, in the direction toward which it points.

PEOPLE: Hard to pin down but probably true, the reported rift between inSANErs **Linus Pauling** and **Norman Cousins**. Cousins apparently has warned his followers that Pauling—just back from a neutralist rally in Oslo—is being used by Communists. . . . African UN representatives from former French colonies believe President **de Gaulle** may yet pull France out of United Nations. . . . **Maurice Thorez,** at four-day meeting of French Communist Party Central Committee last week, a) completed purge of **Marcel Servin, Laurent Casanova** and other Party members who urged greater autonomy for Party and b) claimed it was the French Communists who had forced the collapse of the Generals' Revolt. . . . All confusion about **Yuri Gagarin's** flight will be cleared up with publication of a book on it, say Soviet newsmen, but add that the book is so technical no layman will be able to understand it. (Not even Gagarin?)

Malcolm Moos, President **Eisenhower's** speech writer, has taken job with Rockefeller Bros., will help **Nelson** in '62 campaign. Rockefeller already has speech-writing services of **Emmett J. Hughes,** Ike's first roccoco ghost. . . . Expert-politician **Richard Nixon** has told GOP leaders they must win gubernatorial battles in some, at least, of these key states: Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, California, New Jersey, in '62 if GOP is to have a fighting chance in '64. . . . Former Governor **Theodore McKeldin,** regarded as a Rockefeller man, will try again in Maryland gubernatorial race next year.

Eighty-six British Conservative MPs and one Liberal have protested arrest of **Moise Tshombe**. . . . If **Joseph Kasavubu** does manage to get the Congolese Parliament back into session, there'll be a few empty seats: nine assemblymen, seven senators have met violent deaths since September. . . . **Nikita Khrushchev** boasted a month ago to a U.S. newsman that Communists had so infiltrated the Cuban refugee movement that he, Khrushchev, knew the date of the projected invasion. . . . **King Paul** of Greece is said to have asked **Queen Elizabeth** for a return of the so-called Elgin marbles, which were stripped from the frieze of the Parthenon. . . . **Abdel Gamal Nasser** agitating for the return to Egypt of the world-famous head of Nefertiti which West Germany now has.

President **Charles B. Shuman** of American Farm Bureau told the Senate Committee on Agriculture that President **Kennedy's** farm program might cost $15-$20 billion a year, compared to the present $7-$9 billion. . . . Out Minnesota way, the word is that Senator **Hubert Humphrey** has more solutions than there are problems.

The Algerian affair evoked almost automatically what amounts to a Popular Front, stretching from the Communist Party through the Socialists, Mendèsistes, Radicals, etc., and including all three of the trade union federations (Communist, Socialist and Catholic). We know from a hundred experiences since the first great Popular Front was formed—also in France—in 1936 what the general direction of its politics must be in international policy: toward coexistence, appeasement and friendship with the Soviet Union; toward a weakening of ties with the other Western powers and in particular, in this period, with the United States; toward pacifism and a decay of military strength.

The continuing rejoicing in the West over de Gaulle's triumph is likely to turn very quickly bitter as the weeks go by.

Jack Loves Jimmy

Little Jimmy Hoffa is well along in his scheme to make every teamster contract expire on the same day a couple of years from now—a scheme, once realized, that would give him the power to turn the traffic lights red simultaneously all over the country. If Jimmy should then sit on his contracts until his demands are met, the entire national economy would roll to a halt within a few days.

Not content with this modest goal, Jimmy has also been huddling with two patriots by name of Bradley and Curran, the chief stewards of the Longshoremen's and Maritime unions, with an eye to setting up some sort of mutual assistance treaty. Bradley recently backed out rather than to incur the disapproval of the AFL-CIO, which suspended Jimmy and his boys in 1957 on the grounds of corruption. But an agreement of some sort may be reached among the three, and it's a fair guess that Jimmy Hoffa will enjoy increased power as a result of it.

Meanwhile, the Department of Justice is said to be "awaiting developments." Bobby Kennedy, who was rather nasty to Jimmy Hoffa during the McClellan Committee hearings, seems to be more open-minded these days. His Department, to be sure, has cleverly circumvented the express wish of Congress by finding extraordinary powers that allow it to intervene in the school segregation cases as a plaintiff—but the sharp legal minds can't quite find anything that applies to Hoffa and his bid to control everything that floats as well as everything that rolls.

The Justice Department finds no difficulty in applying the anti-trust law in three different ways: against General Electric when it sells at the same price as its competitors; against General Motors when it undersells the competition; against the drug industry when it sells "too high." But when a sawed-off semi-literate megalomaniac grabs control of a major transportation industry—well, the distinction is obvious if you happen to be a bureaucrat in a labor-dominated Administration. *That's* not monopoly; it's self-determination, or something.

• At Home •

Washington

Double-jointed is the word for the Kennedy Administration. It proposes one program, but before the dust has settled it offers another which negates it. A prime example is the question of postal rates. Having strenuously attacked President Eisenhower's efforts to balance the Post Office budget by raising the rates on mail service, the Democrats now propose to do just that. But while Administration lobbyists beat the drums for this measure on Capitol Hill, President Kennedy adds to the Post Office deficit—and hands the Communists a juicy plum—by suspending an eleven-year-old ban on handling an annual 15 million books, magazines, newspapers, and other propaganda from the Iron Curtain countries. Since the Soviet Union does not allow the free flow of American printed matter via the mails, the United States is now subsidizing Communist propaganda on a vast scale.

Mr. Kennedy's reasons for giving the Reds this free service is hard to follow. He claimed that the ban was "harmful" to the United States and served "no useful Intelligence function." But harmful how? Scholars and government agencies were permitted to receive any Iron Curtain publications they needed in their work. So were newspapermen specializing in Soviet affairs. The flood of propaganda mail usually went to people who had never asked for it but had gotten on local Communist "sucker lists." First class mail was not touched by the Post Office. And no one argued that the ban was designed to serve an Intelligence function. Its main purpose was to prevent the abuse of our postal system by the Communists.

At this writing, it can be authoritatively reported that the carefully planted news stories of a "possible" meeting between President Kennedy and Comrade Khrushchev were a trial balloon. Mr. Kennedy and his fellow Democrats stridently attacked the whole concept of "summitry" during the 1960 campaign. After the election, Secretary of State Dean Rusk proposed a return to the old forms of diplomacy. But the linked disasters in Cuba and Laos have shaken our policy makers—and they are once more heeding the quiet voices of the State Department's curiously-motivated middle echelon. Like every President since FDR, Mr. Kennedy is convinced that if he can "sit down and talk man-to-man" with Comrade Khrushchev, the Communists will see the light and mend their ways. That the United States has come home in a barrel from every top-level meeting with the Soviet leadership somehow does not penetrate. President Kennedy has been flattered into believing that, though the others failed, he is smart enough to succeed. But he has grown timid in the last months. So he was testing out the public

reaction by the time-honored method of a news leak to sympathetic members of the press.

Domestically, the Administration's greatest problem is to persuade Congress to continue foreign aid at its present high level, despite the continuing unfavorable balance of payments and the drain on U.S. gold. The bright boys have decided, however, that opposition is so great that an end run is necessary. Very slowly, the taxpayer has been learning that much of this country's bounty is going down a rat hole. Just one example tells the stroy: $825 million to Indochina prior to Dienbienphu and the Communist takeover in North Vietnam; since then $1.7 billion to South Vietnam, $250 million to Cambodia, $300 million to Laos. And the result: The State Department has frankly written off Laos; Cambodia is "neutralist" and moving slowly into the Communist camp; South Vietnam is tottering. All of Southeast Asia, moreover, looks on the United States with growing cynicism and antagonism.

President Kennedy's answer to these facts is to ask for the creation of an over-all foreign aid administration which will have the right to dip into the Treasury during the next five years to the tune of $7.3 billion—this sum to be over and above what Congress appropriates for other foreign aid adventures. In short, the President wants a multi-billion check to be spent by his administrators without let or hindrance from the Congress. The excuse: "Long-range planning" is necessary. But what it really amounts to is a demand for a free hand—the kind of pernicious "back-door" spending which has become so prevalent in the past decades. Once the $7.3 billion is theirs, the foreign aid enthusiasts will be able to do what they want—and where—with no legislative supervision and no questions asked.

The faces are long and the sighs deep at the AFL-CIO's fancy palace on Sixteenth Street. For the first time since the merger, there seems to be a possibility of an irreparable break between Walter Reuther's industrial unions and George Meany's craft unions. When Mr. Reuther agreed to combine his CIO with the AFL, he thought it would be duck soup to infiltrate the new organization and take it over. The first step in his strategy was to toss out James Hoffa and the Teamsters, which he achieved with the aid of the captive Senate Labor Rackets Committee. The next step was to raid the building trades unions.

But if Jimmy Hoffa was dead, he did not lie down—and he has now joined an alliance with the AFL-CIO's National Maritime Union. The new alliance can cut the AFL-CIO and/or Mr. Reuther's United Auto Workers to bits—and it may do just that. It is reported that Mr. Reuther has asked Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg for aid. But even this desperate intervention may not do the trick.

QUINCY

So it will go as long as the President interests himself only in the profile and not in the substance of courage. What he needs is anti-monopoly legislation applicable against labor unions.

BRIEFS: Pan American and KLM reported that as of last week they had 50,000 applications for seats on planes leaving Cuba. They are booked solid through July. . . . Watch for developments on this theme: That the French generals were backed by anti-Communist German officers, most or all of them ex-Nazis. It's already being plugged in *N.Y. Post*. . . . **The 19 pro-Western or uncommitted African nations meeting in Monrovia, Liberia last week served notice on Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana that they oppose his Pan-African ambitions.** . . . Nkrumah announced the other day, in a note to the State Department, that Ghana reserved the right to "take appropriate action" in the Congo if the UN goofs (by Ghanaian standards). . . . Senators Russell (Ga.), Lausche (Ohio), Hruska (Neb.), Cooper (Ky.), Symington (Mo.), Long (La.) and Keating (N.Y.) oppose the treacherous manner in which Katanga President Tshombe was arrested; they have called for UN action to secure his release.

Official Communist Chinese reports blame weather conditions (storms, drought, floods, etc.) for fact that 150 million acres of cultivated land (half Red China's farmland) has been ravaged this year. Tokyo meteorologists comment: we noted little unusual weather over China during 1960. . . . **One Laotian colonel, with a force recruited largely from the fierce Meo tribesmen, is reported to have inflicted more casualties on the Pathet Lao in the last four months than the entire Royal Laotian Army.** . . . Thai authorities report the Communists (presumably North Vietnamese or Chinese) are training young Thais in guerrilla skills for a Pathet Lao-style advance into Thailand.

Louella Parsons reports that Edward G. Robinson has been asked to star in a movie about the John Birch Society. . . . **Ed Chodorov, identified by three ex-Communists as a Party member, picked to direct *Captains and Kings*, a play about Admiral Rickover.** . . . Republican leadership in Congress pressing for resumption of nuclear tests. It is backed by many hard anti-Communist Democratic leaders, Senators Dodd and Jackson among them.

The word on President Kennedy's reading habits in Washington these days is that he's reading the newspapers more, but enjoying them less.

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly by National Review, Inc., at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. (second class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.). Copyright 1961 in the U.S.A., by National Review, Inc. All manuscripts, letters, subscription orders, changes of address and undeliverable copies should be sent to:

EDITORIAL AND CIRCULATION OFFICES
National Review
150 East 35th St., New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone ORegon 9-7330

RATES: $15.00 a year ($8.00 for the 32-page issues, and $7.00 for the 8-page issues published on the alternate fortnight). The 8-page issues are available separately at $10.00 a year. In all cases, add $1.00 for Canada, $2.00 for other foreign subscriptions.

• Trends •

The parallel adventures of Yuri Gagarin and Alan Shepard—similar in purpose, dissimilar in execution—have stirred unprecedented speculations in a normally credulous free world: did Gagarin actually go into space, or was his much-publicized flight simply a Soviet hoax?

The Gagarin story was marked, as are all of Moscow's claims to prowess in space, by secrecy and contradiction.

There was no way in which anyone could know whether the Soviet announcement was true but plenty of reason for believing, from the discrepancies it contained, that it was salted with a generous serving of fraud.

Shepard, on the other hand, took off from Canaveral in a blaze of clarity. Through the courtesy of the TV cameras, the entire nation could watch his Redstone rocket arc 115 miles into space, and deposit him 300 miles downrange precisely on target. The stark contrast troubled even those whose pet response to Kremlin space claims is a bland and catatonic assent.

Time magazine, for example, had greeted the Gagarin announcement with an enthusiastic burst of credulity. But the magazine's post-Shepard commentary was more guarded. Said *Time*, relating President Kennedy's decision to publicize the venture:

"He had given the go-ahead for the man-shoot not to be made in such secrecy as to cast doubt on the actual accomplishment [as in the case of Russia's Gagarin], but with the whole world watching."

Time thus took cognizance of a growing community of skeptics, a community which includes congressmen James Fulton (R., Pa.), Roman Pucinski (D., Ill.), and Donald Bruce (R., Ind.), as well as Ambassador W. Averell Harriman and Christopher Shawcross of the International Institute of Space Law. Journalists who have raised questions about Gagarin include David Lawrence in both his syndicated columns and *U.S. News & World Report*, Henry Hazlitt, Chicago aviation writer Peter Reich, Fulton Lewis Jr., Walter Winchell and Dorothy Kilgallen.

There were reasons other than secrecy for these misgivings. Few claims to major achievement, in space or on earth, have been so shot through with contradiction. The Communists couldn't get straight when their space man had been launched, when he had returned, whether his spaceship was equipped with "portholes," or how he made it back to earth.

Most curious of all was Gagarin's statement of what he could see from heights ranging up to 188 miles. "While flying over Soviet territory," he said, "I saw perfectly the great square of collective farms. It was possible to distinguish between plowed land and grass land."

Available data suggest that such observations at such heights, if not impossible, are extremely unlikely. Commander Shep Shepard, who could identify the Florida coastline and islands along his path, has yet to say publicly whether he observed minutiae equivalent to farms and plowed fields. But photographs of the earth taken from experimental rockets at heights of 130 miles and more show no such detail.

The comments of the various congressmen focus on these and other peculiarities. Rep. Fulton, whose views carry some weight because he is the ranking minority member of the House Space Committee, says the Soviets, in his estimation, "have not proved" Gagarin went into orbit. Rep. Pucinski believes the various discrepancies indicate the Soviet claim may be a "monumental hoax." Rep. Bruce notes that Moscow was fully prepared with printed biographies of Gagarin, stamps bearing his visage, and commemorative poems, before the alleged flight was even announced. That fact, plus the Kremlin's declaration that Gagarin was "in orbit" before his appointed hour of return, suggest absolute foreknowledge of "success"—since Moscow takes no chance on having to acknowledge failure. But even with the most perfect technology in the world, there is always the possibility of a misfire.

Some of the contradictions in the Gagarin episode, and Moscow's attempts to wriggle out of them, verge on the comical. On April 14, for example, UPI quoted a tractor driver, a Soviet biologist, and Tass, the official news agency, as saying Gagarin had come down by parachute. Yet on the preceeding day, AP wirephoto carried a shot of Gagarin, in space outfit, walking down a ladder from some kind of vehicle. The picture was identified as the "first photo taken of Gagarin after his conquest of outer space"—snapped immediately "after his successful landing." But if Gagarin parachuted, what ladder was he walking down? Either the purported eye-witness accounts were synthetic, or else the photograph was.

A final minor, but thoroughly typical, discrepancy concerns the small matter of Gagarin's hat. The original photographs show him wearing a leather flying helmet similar to that worn by Charles Lindbergh back in 1927. The AP wirephoto mentioned above shows Gagarin clothed in this obsolete headgear. That no "cosmonaut" would go into space wearing anything of the sort was immediately apparent to anyone even remotely acquainted with the sealed, pressurized helmet-and-suit combinations developed in America's own space program.

Evidently realizing as much, Moscow changed its story, and came up with a wildly improbable explanation. After his parachute landing, Tass reported, "The collective farmers helped him to take off the airtight helmet and space suit. The astronaut remained bareheaded and somebody immediately presented him a cap."

All perfectly illogical. A spaceman parachutes out of the sky into a startled group of collective farmers in some remote wasteland of the USSR. The farmers help him out of his space helmet, and one of them, who just happens to have a Lindbergh-style flying cap with him, gives it to the spaceman to put on in time for the photographers (who came from where?) to snap his picture.

As to what such "evidence" proves about Gagarin, the reader may decide for himself. M. Stanton Evans

• Abroad •

London. The economic and political consequences of South Africa's withdrawal from the British Commonwealth, which becomes effective on May 31, has occupied the British Parliament in recent weeks. Mr. Duncan Sandys, outlining the government position in the debate on the Republic of South Africa Bill, said South Africans in the future would no longer have the right to claim British nationality as they do today. It was the feeling of the government that to continue to confer this and other Commonwealth privileges on South Africa would lessen the value of membership. But Britain is also conscious of the fact that demands by the more hostile members of the Commonwealth, Ghana and Ceylon among them, that all ties—trade and otherwise—with South Africa be severed would hurt the other Commonwealth partners very little, but cause economic dislocations on the British Isles since South Africa is an important customer for British cars and industrial products. This, of course, is why the British Labour Party has not pressed harder for a complete break with South Africa.

Paris. The French press, and it would have us believe, the French Government, jumped on the rumor that CIA agents had encouraged the Generals' Revolt and immediately elaborated the story with delicious details. *Le Monde*, notoriously anti-American, first gave the rumor credibility. But it was Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber's *L'Express* which drew the darkest picture of master-spy Allen Dulles and his "state within a state." *Express* stated bluntly that the "highest French authorities" now believe both that the CIA was involved in the Algiers coup and that General Challe would never have embarked on his revolt without CIA's support. As *Express* unfolds its story—in the conditional tense peculiar to French journalism in cases of this sort—American CIA agents "would have" met the conspirators in Madrid on April 12 and "would have" assured them that if the coup succeeded the United States Government would recognize the new French Government within 48 hours. (How agents of the 'state within a state' could commit the United States Government to an action of this immensity is not mentioned.) Other French newspapers even hinted that General Norstad, NATO Supreme Commander, might have been involved on the interesting grounds that both Norstad and Challe served with NATO forces and therefore, presumably, knew each other. No French journalist, however diligent in digging out these and other anti-American details, apparently thought it worth the space to report that the very first story tying CIA to the Generals' Revolt appeared 48 hours after the coup—in *Pravda*.

Luang Prabang. The key to the well-being of the twenty million persons—descendants of the builders of fabulous Angkor and the great Khmer civilization—who live in the interior of Southeast Asia is the mighty Mekong river. Rising, like the Brahma-putra, Yangtse and Hwang Ho, in the Tibetan mountains, the Mekong flows down through a corner of China to Burma, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and the South China Sea. Under a program initiated two years ago by the United Nations, a group of experts from France, Canada, Australia, Japan and the United States, directed by Dr. C. Hart Schaaf, is completing a survey for a twenty year, $600 million project to develop the Mekong, its valley and its tributaries, integrating power, irrigation, flood control and transport—an MVA, in short. Enthusiasts believe that, if means could be found to undertake it, this project, by unifying as well as advancing the Southeast Asian economy, would also promote a political cooperation that would greatly strengthen the region's resistance to Chinese Communist pressure.

Bernie-France

"—Oops! Sorry! I thought you were General Salan!"

New Delhi. To the Indian nationalists, struggling for independence from the British Raj, it was a major source of bitterness that English was India's only "universal language": not that everyone spoke it—only 7 million out of 375 in truth did so—but because it was the only language common to the entire administrative elite and bureaucracy, the language of government, courts, journalism and literature, etc. The Constitution of independent India declared that within a decade Hindi—though actually only a minority tongue among India's several hundred—was to be official. But the decade passed last year with English, in the rather odd Indian version, more strongly entrenched than ever, and spreading more rapidly than any local vernacular. The Constitutional clause has been quietly suspended.

• The Investor •

Some of the most sensational advances in share prices in 1960 and 1961 have been in those of small companies in business areas which have captured the public imagination. Science and technical companies whose stocks have newly become available to the public through underwriters are prominent among these.

The speculative success of many new stock buyers gives them little apparent need for investment counsel. But were they to examine investment portfolios managed by experts, they would find few of the spectacular science stocks.

A newcomer might decide that living through decades of sharp economic and political changes has handicapped the older investor professionals. So it now seems. So it has seemed a number of times in recent years. The race was to the swift newcomers in 1928-29 (I was among them). Again in 1936-37, many new stock buyers took over. It was repeated in 1946, and is with us again in 1960-61.

Perhaps it will be different this time. To one who has lived through 1928-29, 1936-37 and 1946, there is a familiar ring which suggests caution in following the science favorites in their seemingly perpetual rise. The business glamor areas have changed, but the feeling that no price is too high for the popular favorites holds true.

In 1929, radio manufacturing companies were the wave of the future. And so they proved to be, over the longer term. Nevertheless, many of the buyers of radio growth stocks, after the binge was over, suffered egregious losses. Many, on margin, were wiped out. A number of the small radio growth stocks with great promise disappeared, unhonored and unsung. RCA was the industry leader and it is one of the leaders today. However, it took decades for its grossly inflated 1929 price to be reached again.

The 1936-37 stock binge made soft drink stocks the favorite. No price seemed too much to pay for a soft drink distributor or bottling stock. Pepsi-Cola's remarkable success triggered the boom. One hundred times earnings of a soft drink bottling stock seemed amply justified to buyers who a few years later wouldn't pay ten times earnings for the same shares.

And in 1946, many secondary stocks with substantial wartime earnings sold at goodly multiples of these earnings. After the war, low cost production and competitive selling ability became requirements for making profits. Those businesses which had little to offer other than production facilities, faded rapidly.

In each of the binge periods new issues of privately-held or newly-formed smaller companies were distributed in droves, largely to uninformed buyers. Stock after stock rose sharply upon the day of issue. Some continued to climb. Eager purchasers experienced a wonderful thrill. For many of them the thrill turned to sharp pain only too soon.

Possibly today there are fewer "blue sky" issues, but the present is not without its earningless companies sponsored by promoters of attractive dreams, which might come true, but seldom do. Even a small company with an enviable record of growth is risky when it sells at a price of 25 to 100 times earnings.

How should the inexperienced investor select an investment adviser? It is not unlike choosing a medical adviser. Talking to an investment counsellor's clients or a doctor's patients can be helpful. Checking with a doctor's hospital connection offers a second approach as does, in the analogous situation, a check with an investment counsel's bank. And it may save later disappointment to meet and talk at length with the man who will be in direct charge of the investor's portfolio.

There is no perfect answer to the questions: Should I choose a large investment counsel firm or a smaller one? Is a bank adviser better in my case than an investment counsel firm? A bank will almost surely follow a conventional investing pattern. Any other course would subject it to the risk of surcharge in the event of losses. This does not condemn bank investment advice; it merely recognizes that it has limitations.

A large investment counsel firm theoretically should do the best job. It has extensive personnel for investigation of many companies, and it will have experienced senior officers to make policy judgments. However, some investors have left large firms for smaller firms because they have become dissatisfied with the account executive in charge of their accounts. In a smaller firm an attraction is the opportunity of conferring with a principal partner instead of an employee.

In the final analysis, it is the abilities of the individual adviser which determine the investor's success. I hasten to add that the personality of the investor is a factor which cannot be ignored. An adviser can do much better for a cooperative, receptive client than for one who fights each move or is highly critical of mistakes.

How much should you pay an investment adviser? There are many different systems of fees. The important consideration is not the fee but the results achieved. Free advice can be the most expensive if it results in major capital loss. The highest priced investment counsel will prove the cheapest by far if important capital and income growth is accomplished over a period of years.

Is it important that your investment adviser have personal long term holdings in the companies he selects for you? Some advisers prefer to own no shares in companies purchased for clients, on the grounds that their own investment might prejudice them in their selection. Other counsellors (and I am one of these) believe that having a sizable personal stake in companies purchased for clients insures a continuous intensive interest in these stocks.

Not every investor needs counsel. But a well chosen adviser, even though imperfect, will do better in the long run than most investors can do for themselves.

NORVIN R. GREENE